



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Wayne J. Hankey and Douglas Hedley (eds), **Deconstructing Radical Orthodoxy: Postmodern Theology, Rhetoric and Truth**

**Citation for published version:**

Grumett, D 2006, 'Wayne J. Hankey and Douglas Hedley (eds), Deconstructing Radical Orthodoxy: Postmodern Theology, Rhetoric and Truth', *New Blackfriars*, vol. 87, no. 1009, pp. 322-323.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2006.00121.x>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1111/j.1741-2005.2006.00121.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2006.00121.x)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

New  
Blackfriars

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: (2006), Index 2006. New Blackfriars, 87: 671-675, which has been published in final form at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2006.00121.x>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**DECONSTRUCTING RADICAL ORTHODOXY: POSTMODERN THEOLOGY, RHETORIC AND TRUTH** edited by Wayne Hankey and Douglas Hedley, *Ashgate*, Aldershot and Burlington, Vt, 2005, £50, Pp. xviii+191 hbk.

Radical Orthodoxy defers to no experts and engages in no dialogues. Radical Orthodoxy does not recognize other valid points of view outside the theological. Radical Orthodoxy believes that nihilism is nearer the truth than humanism. Radical Orthodoxy utterly rejects the cynicism and pseudo-adulthood of the present age. Radical Orthodoxy relishes the task of sharing a delight in the hermetic with uninitiated others. Radical Orthodoxy detests evangelicalism, because it is creepy, voluntaristic and therefore nihilistic. Radical Orthodoxy rejects the idolization of academic politeness as part of that legacy of civic humanism which substituted manners for a true liturgical order grounded in a collectively shared vision.

The above statements are not excerpts from a spoof manifesto of Radical Orthodoxy produced by the movement's detractors, but taken from its own Twenty-Four Theses which enunciated its founding principles. Its love of rhetoric and paradox, hostile construction of modernity, revisionist intellectual historiography, and intense collegiality all mean that few people who have encountered Radical Orthodoxy have responded neutrally to it.

This collection is the first thorough critical response, and as such presents a way into Radical Orthodoxy which appropriates its own methodology: exposition by means of critique and subversion. Many of the British and Canadian contributors focus on the often contentious readings of various figures in the movement's pantheon of heroes and villains, including Plato, Augustine, Aquinas, Scotus, Hegel, Kierkegaard and Derrida. Others explore specific themes, such as subjectivity, politics and the eucharist. The essays are varied. John Marenbon's on Aquinas is brilliantly lucid, and Eli Diamond's on Platonic liturgy, George Pattison's on transubstantiation and Steven Shakespeare's on Kierkegaard each have much to commend them. Douglas Hedley and Wayne Hankey both explore, appropriately, wider implications of the critique, and their contributions help to make the collection far more than an exercise in fault-finding.

The volume does not include an essay examining Radical Orthodoxy's treatment of modern French catholic thinkers like Maurice Blondel and Henri de Lubac. This partly reflects a curious preference amongst Anglo-American theologians for modern French philosophers with often tenuous commitment to the Christian faith. The Blondelian perspective lies, however, at the roots of Radical Orthodoxy's strident anti-secular and anti-modern rhetoric and its hostility to any form of self-validating philosophical discourse. De Lubac features above all via his theology of the supernatural, in which he demonstrates the dependence of nature on divine action. The movement's use of these ideas poses large questions, however. In the case of Blondel, how convincing is the transposition of his critique of secularity from the Third Republic into the British, American or German intellectual and political traditions? Is his critique not itself founded on a particular set of contingent socio-political circumstances which are now of primarily historical interest and need to be overcome by a more Pauline vision of the polis ordained to exercise functions of government autonomously within a limited yet extensive sphere? In De Lubac's case, to what extent does talk of the dependence of nature on the supernatural which infuses the world, slip too easily into the completely different notion of an easy passage from nature to the supernatural achieved by nature itself? De Lubac is quite clear that nature's desire for the supernatural can only be a divine gift. He also has his own particular target in view: the strict observance Thomism of the earlier twentieth century, endorsed by the official commentary of Cajetan republished with the Leonine *Summa theologiae*. How relevant is this historic attack on scholasticism to present-day church and theology?

Any thoroughgoing critique of Radical Orthodoxy needs, however, to offer constructive alternatives. It is easy to identify the movement's weaknesses, with Procrustean historiography and a reluctance to learn from competent scholars in the numerous fields it traverses being among the more obvious. Radical Orthodoxy has nevertheless succeeded in capturing imagination and revivifying the often sterile world of theological debate. Its ingenious use of

postmodern packaging, and the intangible yet pervasive aura of authority, exclusivity and intrigue emanating from it, have attracted many younger scholars, particularly those in Anglican ministry of catholic persuasion. Radical Orthodoxy justifies the continued existence of churches and church ministry in a postliberal world: the Church is the only true community, theology is the discourse on which all others depend, liturgy is the consummation of the whole of human life, and secularity needs to be undermined comprehensively. Any challenge to such clear, simple principles as these needs to be prosecuted with similar verve and panache if it is to gain wide acceptance.

The early growth of Radical Orthodoxy was very much a phenomenon of Cambridge theology, with members identified and principles transmitted by means of the one-on-one tutorial system, and its novelty and interactive character prized as much as thorough research or rigorous scholarship. Since then, the movement has diffused both geographically and intellectually as personalities have moved on and ideas have spread. It will be interesting to see how long it is able to preserve any coherent identity.

DAVID GRUMETT